

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Claims 1, 2, 4-12, 25, 26, 28-36, 49, 50, and 52- 60 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4-12, 25, 26, 28-36, 49, 50, and 52- 60 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over Raff (U.S. Patent No. 6,785,868) in view of Barnett (U.S. Patent No. 6,369,840). Applicants traverse with respect to the amended claims.

Amended claims 1, 25, and 49 concern accessing calendar information of users in a database for presentation by a personal information manager, and require: maintaining scheduled event records for users within the database, including a given user; maintaining information for the given user on shadowed events for a tracked entity that are part of the tracked entity's scheduled event records, wherein the tracked entity was selected by the given user; providing from the database scheduled event records for the given user and information on shadowed events of at least one tracked entity, wherein the scheduled event records of the given user are capable of being scheduled at calendar times that overlap with scheduled shadowed events for the at least one tracked entity; displaying information on the provided scheduled event records and shadowed events for a time period in response to displaying the given user's scheduled event records; receiving selection from the given user to add a selected shadowed event to the given user's scheduled event records; and adding the selected shadowed event to the given user's scheduled event records in the database, wherein shadowed event records from the tracked entity added to the given user's scheduled event records are displayed as part of the given user's scheduled event records; and generating a conflict signal if scheduled event records for one user are scheduled for overlapping calendar times, and wherein the conflict signal is not generated if at least one shadowed event record and scheduled event record for which the information is displayed are scheduled for overlapping calendar times.

Applicants amended claims 1, 25, and 49 to include the requirements of dependent claims 73, 75, and 77 of generating a conflict signal if scheduled event records for one user are scheduled for overlapping calendar times, and wherein the conflict signal is not generated if at least one shadowed event record and scheduled event record for which the information is displayed are scheduled for overlapping calendar times. Claims 73, 75, and 77 are canceled. Applicants note that the original claims 1, 25, and 49 substantially included this requirement being added back to claims 1, 25, and 49.

The Examiner found that Barnett teaches adding tracked entities shadowed event records to the user's personal database. (Third Office Action, pgs. 3-4) The Examiner modified Raff's discussion of shadowed event records with Barnett. Applicants traverse on the ground that modifying Raff with Barnett is improper because Raff teaches away from adding a selected shadowed event to the given user's scheduled events.

Raff states that "[i]t is appreciated that while any of the calendar information can be updated ... by computer 100a, changes made by the computer 100a to categories that are not the default will not be synchronized back to the database." (Raff, col. 13, line 64 to col. 14, line 3) Thus, the changes to scheduled events or calendar information for non-default category users, e.g., wife, child2, etc., are not added to the default category in the database. Raff further states that "the category designation 445 of the shared calendar information 456 is not allowed to be altered." (Raff, col. 11, lines 45-50).

Thus, it is inappropriate to modify Raff with Barnett's alleged teaching of adding shadowed event records to the user's scheduled event records because Raff teaches away from adding a shadowed user's scheduled events (i.e., the non-default category calendar events) to the given user's database, i.e., the default user.

With respect to claims 73, 75, and 77 added to independent claims 1, 25, and 49, the Examiner cited Raff and FIG. 4c and col. 14, line 1 of Tognazzini (U.S. Patent No. 5,790,974) as teaching the claim requirements concerning generating a conflict signal. (Third Office Action, pgs. 10-11)

The Examiner cited FIG. 17 of Raff as teaching the claim requirement of not generating a conflict signal if a shadowed event record and scheduled event record are scheduled for overlapping times. The Examiner cited FIG. 4c of Tognazzini as teaching the claim requirement of generating a conflict signal for scheduled event records for one user at overlapping times. (Third Office Action, pg. 10). Applicants traverse.

The cited FIG. 17 of Raff shows user personal events and tracked events at the same time. However, nowhere does the cited Raff anywhere teach or suggest the issue of conflict signals with respect to shadowed and scheduled events scheduled for overlapping times. (Third Office Action, p. 10)

Tognazzini discusses looking at a person's calendar, current location and traffic and travel data to determine whether there is a conflict with a scheduled appointment. (Tognazzini,

col. 13, lines 43-67) The cited FIG. 4c of Tognazzini discusses a conflict resolution policy, such that an agent prompts a user whether an alternate travel desired. If the user does not want an alternate route or to modify the schedule, then the user is prompted to send a message of the delay for the upcoming meeting. The user may select an alternate route and determine whether there is a conflict.

The Examiner cited Raff and Tognazzini for different parts of this claim limitation. Raff discusses displaying shadowed events and user scheduled events at overlapping times and Tognazzini discusses generating conflicts for user scheduled events. The Manual of Patent Examination and Procedure (“MPEP”) makes clear that the “mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination.” MPEP Sec. 2143.01, p. 2100-131 (Rev. 2, May 2004).

Here, neither Raff or Tognazzini teach or suggest the claim requirements of not generating a conflict signal for user scheduled event records and shadowed event records scheduled at overlapping times in combination with generating conflict signals for user scheduled events at overlapping times. Nowhere is there any teaching or suggestion of this combination claim requirement for handling conflict signals for overlapping user scheduled event records and, separately, handling conflict signals for overlapping shadowed and user scheduled event records. Further, nowhere does the cited art suggest the desirability of the claimed conflict policy for different overlapping situations for user scheduled events and shadowed events and user scheduled events.

Yet further, although the cited Raff shows tracked events scheduled at the same time as the user’s personal calendar events, the cited Raff nowhere teaches or suggests the issue of conflict signals with respect to overlapping shadowed and user scheduled events.

Thus, even if the different references were found to teach each of the separate limitations, there is still no teaching or suggestion of the combination of claim requirements for how to handle conflict signals with respect to overlapping user scheduled event records and overlapping shadowed and user scheduled event records.

Accordingly, amended claims 1, 25, and 49 are patentable over the cited art because the cited of Raff does not teach or suggest all the claim requirements.

Claims 2, 4-12, 26, 28-36, 50, and 52- 60 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from one of claims 1, 25, and 49. Moreover, the following dependent claims provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Claims 8, 32, and 56 depend from claims 1, 25, and 49 and further require that if the selected shadowed event is scheduled for a calendar time overlapping a calendar time of a scheduled event record, then overriding the scheduled event record for the overlapping time period with the selected shadowed event.

The Examiner cited FIG. 17 of Raff as teaching the additional requirements of these claims. (Third Office Action, pg. 5) Applicants traverse.

The cited FIG. 17 of Raff shows how events of selected other users, e.g., wife and child, may be displayed with the default calendar events. Nowhere does the cited FIG. 17 anywhere teach or suggest that the selected shadowed event overrides overlapping scheduled event records. In fact, the cited FIG. 17 teaches away from this requirement because FIG. 17 shows shadowed and default user events with one another. There is no indication in FIG. 17 that the events of the other users, e.g., wife and child, override the default user's events.

Accordingly, claims 8, 32, and 56 provide additional requirements of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not taught or suggested in the cited Raff.

2. Claims 3, 27, and 51 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner rejected claims 3, 27, and 51 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over Raff in view of Coleman (U.S. Patent No. 6,262,732). (Third Office Action, pgs. 7-8)

Claims 3, 26, and 51 depend from claims 2, 26, and 50 and further require that the information on the shadowed events is displayed as transparent text and the information on the scheduled events are displayed as solid text.

These claims are patentable over the cited art because they depend from base claims 1, 25, and 49, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above and because the additional requirements of these claims provide further grounds of patentability over the cited art for the following reasons.

The Examiner cited Coleman as teaching transparent text and that it would be obvious to modify the shadowed events of Raff to display the shadowed events as transparent text with the

motivation to provide the user with more information on a limited display. (Third Office Action, pg. 7) Applicants traverse.

Although the cited Coleman discusses transparent text, nowhere does either cited reference, Raff or Coleman, anywhere teach or suggest that shadowed events are displayed as transparent text and user scheduled events as solid text. There is simply no suggestion of the modification the Examiner proposes. Moreover, the purported motivation does not suggest that one use the particular claimed arrangement of transparent text for shadowed events and solid text for user events because there are many ways one may provide the user with more information on a limited display.

Accordingly, claims 3, 26, and 51 provide additional requirements of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not taught or suggested in the cited Raff or Coleman.

3. Claims 21, 24, 45, 48, 69, and 72 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner found that claims 21, 24, 25, 48, 69, and 72 are obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over Raff in view of Moon (U.S. Patent No. 6,064,975). Applicants traverse with respect to the amended claims.

Amended claims 21, 45, and 69 recite implementing a personal information manager in an electronic calendar device for a user, and require: displaying scheduled records for a designated time period of the user in the electronic calendar; providing scheduled event records for the user and information on shadowed events of at least one tracked person, wherein the scheduled event records are capable of being scheduled at calendar times that overlap with scheduled shadowed events for the at least one tracked; displaying information on the provided scheduled event records and shadowed events for a time period; and displaying location information providing a current location of the tracked person provided by an electronic device with the tracked person transmitting location information; and generating a conflict signal if scheduled event records for one user are scheduled for overlapping calendar times, and wherein the conflict signal is not generated if at least one shadowed event record and scheduled event record for which the information is displayed are scheduled for overlapping calendar times.

Applicants amended claims 21, 45, and 69 to include the generating conflict signal requirement of dependent claims 74, 76, and 78, which were canceled.

The Examiner cited col. 5, line 29 of Moon as teaching the additional requirements of these claims. (Third Office Action, pgs. 8-9) The cited col. 5 mentions that one can activate a button to indicate the location of a party with whom ones portable electronic device is having or had communication with. Although the cited Moon mentions displaying location information of another person or device, nowhere does the cited Moon or other art anywhere teach or suggest the claim requirement of displaying location information on a tracked person whose shadowed events are displayed with the scheduled events of the user. This particular combination of displaying the location of tracked users whose shadowed events are displayed with scheduled events is nowhere taught or suggested in the cited art.

Here, the Examiner is suggesting a modification nowhere taught or suggested in the cited art – displaying location information on a tracked person whose shadowed events are displayed with the scheduled events of the user. For this reason, the proposed modification is not proper.

The Examiner cited Tognazzini with respect to the requirements of claims 74, 76, and 78 added to claims 21, 45, and 69. (Third Office Action, pg. 11) Applicants submit that the added requirements of generating the conflict signal for overlapping user scheduled events and not generating the conflict signal for overlapping shadowed events and user scheduled events are not taught or suggested in the cited Tognazzini for the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1, 25, and 49.

Accordingly, claims 21, 45, and 69 are patentable over the cited art because the cited combination does not teach or suggest the claim requirements.

Claims 24, 58, and 72 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from claims 21, 45, and 69, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above, and because the additional requirements of these claims in combination with the base claims provide further grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1-5, 7-12, 21, 24-29, 31-36, 45, 48-53, 55-60, 69, and 72 are patentable over the art of record. Applicants submit herewith the fee for the one month extension of time. Should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0447.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: May 12, 2006

By: /David Victor/

David W. Victor
Registration No. 39,867

Please direct all correspondences to:

David Victor
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: 310-553-7977
Fax: 310-556-7984